Form 22

SEP - 8 2010

FORM 22. Transcript Purchase Order

AT 8:30____M WILLIAM T. WALSH, CLERK

United States Court	of Appeals for	the Federal Circuit
Eli Lilly and Company) Appeal from	☐ U.S. District Court for Dist. of New Jersey ☐ Court of International Trade
—versus— Actavis Elizabeth LLC	•	☐ Court of Federal Claims T NO. 2:07-cv-3770-DMC-JAD JRT NO. 2010-1500
TRANS((See Rules 10(b) and 11(b)	CRIPT PURCHASE o) of the Federal Rule	
PART 1 - TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPEL When filing this form, distribute copies Court; 1 copy to the appellee; 1 copy re	as follows: 3 copies	DAYS OF FILING OF NOTICE OF APPEAL. to the court reporter; 1 copy to the Trial
lars): Entire trial transcript is requested	file the reporter for a tra	nnscript of the following proceedings (give particu- repared unless specifically requested.
B. I certify that financial arrangements have be	en made with the rep	attach a statement of the issues to Copies 4 and 5. orter. Payment is by: ranscript has been submitted to the trial judge.
SIGNED Lagra Maswork DAT ADDRESS 901 New York Ave., N.W., Wastington TELEPHONE 202-408-4000	n, DC 20001	NSEL FOR Eli Lilly and Company
PART II - TO BE COMPLETED BY THE COUR 2 copies retained by the reporter; 1 copy order is received. Date Purchase Order received: Estimated completion date: Estimated number of pages: I certify that satisfactory financial arrangements have cost of the transcript.	to be transmitted to	the Court of Appeals on same date transcript be been completed with appellant for payment of the
		Signature and Date
PART III - NOTIFICATION THAT TRANSCRIPT (To be completed by court reporter on d forwarded to Court of Appeals on the sa This is to certify that the transcript has been completeday.	HAS BEEN FILED late of filing transcrip	t in Trial Court and this notification must be
Date		Signature

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

- 1. Should this Court reverse the trial court's decision holding the claims of the '590 patent invalid for lack of utility where (1) the trial court found that the claimed invention is useful in fact, (2) the trial court found that the '590 patent discloses how to use atomoxetine to treat ADHD, (3) the claimed invention was the subject of a Phase II clinical trial approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) and the FDA prior to the filing date of the application, and (4) Lilly had actual clinical trial data showing atomoxetine was effective in treating ADHD in humans mere months after the filing date of the application and long before the issuance of the patent?
- 2. Should an ANDA applicant that specifically labels its approved product only for an infringing use be permitted to avoid liability for contributory infringement on summary judgment by asserting the existence of unapproved uses for which its product is not labeled or approved, particularly where the issue turned on disputed material facts?